Manitoba
Intercultural
Council
500-283 Bannatyne Ave., Winnipeg, Man. R3B 3B2
(204) 945-4576 Toll Free 1-800-282-8069

Conseil
Interculturel
du Manitoba
283, ave. Bannatyne, bureau 500, Winnipeg (Man.) R3B 3B2
tel. (204) 945-4576; sans frais 1-800-282-8069

Observations on the Green Paper

of the

Task Force on Multiculturalism in Manitoba

January 9, 1988

Manitoba

MG 14080

88-02584/

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Manitoba Intercultural Council welcomes this opportunity to meet with the Task Force on Multiculturalism in Manitoba to discuss the Task Force's Green Paper.

The opportunity to develop a comprehensive multiculturalism policy is an exciting and a challenging one. It must be remembered, however, that a policy is meaningless if it does not meet the expectations and aspirations of our ethnocultural communities, if it does not fully involve them in both the development and implementation of the policies and programs emanating from it, if it does not add to the quality of life for all Manitobans, and if it is not based on a realistic view of the political, social, cultural and economic circumstances of the province. We are confident that the Task Force is proceeding with these in mind.

The context in which the decision to undertake a review of multicultural policy was taken is critical if we are to have, at the end of this process, a policy and proposals which are not only well-intentioned and enlightened but also implemented by the Government of Manitoba.

The Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, Honourable Judy Wasylycia-Leis, made known her decision to undertake the development of a comprehensive policy for multiculturalism on December 6, 1986 in a major address to the Manitoba Intercultural Council. She indicated then, as she did when announcing the formation of the Task Force in May 1987, that "we will assess programs that exist in all government departments which support the ethnocultural community, determine who they serve, what needs they meet and what gaps exist."

She also observed that "Manitoba's experience (in multiculturalism) has become a model for others and has placed an extra responsibility on all of us to take the next step and really focus on where we want to be in the next decade."

The Minister continued : "...I would be deceiving you if I were to suggest it will be easy. With our current economy and with no increases in government department spending it will be difficult...I think we must begin to address the reality, we must find new and creative ways to meet the needs of the community without adding more cost."

"We (government, MIC and the communities) must cooperatively, and as true partners, chart a path for the next decade," added the Minister:

> ...We must develop a cohesive strategy for growth and development of our communities. Our goal must be to assist ethnocultural communities to be more self-reliant, more politically aware and more self-sufficient. We must ensure the strengthening of cross-cultural awareness and communication among all citizens of Manitoba.
>
> We must implement more effective planning and greater responsiveness to community needs by both government and community organizations.
>
> We must avoid duplication. All funders must be encouraged to develop a coherent strategy to achieve coordination, consultation and cooperation among funders and ethnocultural communities to maximize existing human and financial resources.

"This is a tremendous challenge," she observed. Indeed, and it is a challenge which the Manitoba Intercultural Council has accepted and is integrating into all its activities. It is a challenge which the Task Force on Multiculturalism must accept and answer. It is a challenge which might best be answered by the joint and complementary work of the Task Force and the MIC.

2.0 THE GREEN PAPER OF THE TASK FORCE ON MULTICULTURALISM

2.1 The Elements of a Policy

The Green Paper proposes the outline of a multiculturalism policy and presents several assumptions and rationales in support of those assumptions. We fully endorse the three principles of Equality, Dignity and Community put forward as the basis of a multicultural policy. We find the Green Paper's argument most compelling:

> Since a multicultural society is one which is composed of several cultural groups whose identities are based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour or religion, a policy on multiculturalism should be based on the recognition of these diverse cultures and be guided by the following three principles:
>
> - we all have an ethnic origin (equality);
> - all our cultures deserve respect (dignity); and
> - cultural pluralism needs official support (community).
>
> A Multicultural Policy should also seek to respond to the needs of this diversity in cultural, social, economic and political terms. It should promote economic integration of all and, in the interest of social equality, should assist those who so wish to maintain their distinctive cultural identities. Such a policy should also affirm, support and enhance the positive attributes of the diverse cultures of Manitobans, to achieve a just and harmonious society.
> (Task Force on Multiculturalism, Green Paper, pp. 7-8)

We agree with the assumptions and rationales put forward in the Green Paper which have apparently guided the preparation of the Paper's recommendations. We must observe, however, that the basic assumptions underlying a multicultural policy are incomplete. The omissions are surprising since, on the one hand, a fundamental reality of Manitoba society is overlooked and, on the other hand, the most critical aspect of a policy on multiculturalism is ignored.

The first element underlying a policy of multiculturalism which the Green Paper omits is the fundamental and inextricable relationship between multiculturalism, official languages and the aboriginal peoples. The reality of the unique historical and constitutional status of both the aboriginal peoples and the official languages is inescapable and forms the essential bedrock on which multiculturalism must rest. The introductory history in the Green Paper briefly makes this point, as does more fully the Report of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Multiculturalism (June 1987).

So important is the recognition of the aboriginal peoples and bilingualism that the Manitoba Intercultural Council states in the Preamble to its own by-laws:

> Manitoba is officially a bilingual province. It is also a multi-ethnic society. The French language has a unique historical and constitutional position in Manitoba, a position reaffirmed by rulings of the Supreme Court of Canada and by government policy. The cultural face of Manitoba has always been rich and varied, beginning with the indigenous peoples and further diversified by the dozens of ethnocultural groups who have chosen this province as their home.

Any policy of multiculturalism for Manitoba must explicitly recognize the complementary roles of bilingualism and multiculturalism, must recognize the historical and constitutional status of Manitoba's native peoples, and must include them in all aspects of such a policy.

The second and most critical element underlying a policy of multiculturalism with which the Green Paper does not deal is the centrality of ethnocultural communities to any such policy. The Green Paper puts forward many proposals but seldom does it acknowledge the presence of our communities and their role in the development and evaluation of government programs. Rather, the Green Paper concentrates on a legalistic framework into which the communities must fit and proposes administrative approaches which do not involve the communities and which would duplicate that which the communities are already doing on their own and through the Manitoba Intercultural Council.

The Manitoba Intercultural Council categorically rejects the suggestion that multiculturalism, and particularly group development, must "take place within the context of policy guidelines (Green Paper, p.13)." Rather, in our view policy must be developed within the expressed needs and aspirations of the ethnocultural communities. It is this which the Manitoba Intercultural Council continually strives to do, and it is this which the communities expect of a multicultural policy.

It follows therefore that the ethnocultural communities must be active participants in the policy development process. It also follows that they must be equipped with the tools and the skills to take part and that they must be involved in evaluating and monitoring those programs and policies.

The critical question to be addressed, and it goes to the heart of multiculturalism, is how to facilitate development of the ethnocultural communities so that they can determine their own needs and aspirations and determine their future course of action to achieve their aspirations. That future may or may not require government funding, legislative intervention or departmental programs; but that future most assuredly must be one envisioned by the communities, not by the bureaucracy.

This is true of all communities, established and newcomer, visible minority and non-visible. The needs vary, of course, and the issues of concern differ. But when one probes deeper into any community the same core needs emerge. These needs can only be addressed by a coherent strategy of community development.

2.2 Recommendations of the Green Paper

The Green Paper suggests that "a Policy on Multiculturalism in Manitoba must rest on three fundamental issues: a) Culture; b) Equality; c) An administrative structure to ensure the fulfillment of individual and group expectations as recommended by the Task Force(p.13)."

We disagree. There are only two fundamental issues which a Policy on Multiculturalism must address:

> 1) how to ensure that the ethnocultural communities have the tools, skills and knowledge to determine their needs and aspirations; to chart the course of their own development; and to make those known to all sectors of Manitoban society;

2) how to ensure that governmental structures will facilitate this process; will respond and be responsive to the communities; will involve the communities in the development and implementation of programs; and will ensure the fulfillment of group expectations as the communities determine those expectations to be.

There is little in most of the recommendations put forward in the Green Paper with which we disagree; most are reiterations of policy proposals made by the Manitoba Intercultural Council over the past four years. Indeed, 29 of the 38 recommendations pertaining to Culture and Equality in the Green Paper have previously been put forward by the Manitoba Intercultural Council. (See Appendix I "Comparison of Task Force Recommendations June, 1987 and Manitoba Intercultural Council Recommendations 1983-1987.")

Some of the recommendations in the Green Paper are out of date. For example, the Green Paper calls for "provincial government advertising policy (to) include a requirement that the ethnocultural reality be recognized." In 1984 the Manitoba Intercultural Council proposed to the Government a policy statement regarding the portrayal of minorities in government advertising and communications; the Government of Manitoba has had such a policy in place since 1985.

There are many areas of critical concern which are not discussed in the Green Paper and which must be addressed by the Task Force. For example, there is no reference to the question of the taxation of cultural facilities, an issue which has specifically been referred to the Task Force by the Minister. There is no discussion of the degree to which newcomers can access the health and social services system in the province. In previous recommendations and in ongoing research, the Manitoba Intercultural Council has clearly demonstrated that there is a gross lack of culturally and linguistically appropriate services in the health and social services areas. There is no significant discussion of the degree and nature of settlement services which the province should provide to newcomers. In the post-Meech Lake Canada this is an area of critical importance. We would note, as one example, the request of some Haitian, Laotian, and Vietnamese groups for classes in <u>French</u> as a Second Language (F.L.S.). There is no discussion of how services for seniors can be appropriately delivered. There is no discussion of the linkage of federal and provincial policies on multiculturalism. There is no discussion of new strategies of funding for the ethnocultural communities, a particularly important question when the entire lotteries system is under review. And there is no discussion of the Manitoba Intercultural Council and its place within a provincial policy on multiculturalism.

Some of the recommendations are far too narrowly constructed and neglect the critical importance of community development. This is particularly well illustrated in the Green Paper's discussion of "Cultural Group Development," by which the Paper means only "communities wishing to organize around cultural programmes (p.15)."

The Green Paper goes on to critique even this inadequate definition of group development by advancing cliche-ridden and discredited negative arguments: "it leads to ghettoization, isolation and social distance. Indeed, many have argued that this emphasis results in balkanization and even encourages ethnocentrism and prejudice among the various groups (p.16)." We need only observe that exactly these arguments were advanced in the early part of this century to justify excluding "undesirable elements" from Canada.

Perhaps it is the uncritical acceptance of the latter argument which prompts the Green Paper to speak only of "Cultural Group Development." The cultural manifestations of ethnocultural communities - what is known as symbolic ethnicity - are now widely accepted and are therefore "safe". We acknowledge that there is a balance for every community to draw between its own social cohesion and its relations with the wider society. However, the potential of group isolation will not be overcome by the Green Paper's suggestion for "conferences" and "joint planning committees" of "various organizations and service institutions." These are not the solution, though they are undoubtedly part of it.

In the winter of 1986-87 the Manitoba Intercultural Council began a series of consultations with a varied range of communities. As expected, the focus of interest differed dramatically among the communities, though there were many surprising similarities. However, a core of needs emerged, upon which the MIC reported in March 1987:

> It has become apparent that most ethnocultural communities lack the funds, the human resources and the expertise to respond to the demands from their own community, from the community at large and from government funders. These problems, which are common to both established and to emerging communities, are rooted in the absence of long-range developmental strategies by the communities themselves and by funders.
>
> As a consequence several communities have limited their initiatives to those which readily meet funding criteria and so ignore or downplay organizational goals, and they become depende t o relatively small amounts of government funding .
>
> The broader consequences of these are that there is inefficient use of the human and financial resources within communities, there are few cross-cultural or intercultural activities, there is a growing dependency on public funds, there is an emphasis on the "symbolic" aspects of multiculturalism, there is a dearth of administrative skills in many community organizations, there is a low level of participation in the political process by ethnocultural communities and an absence of public discussion on multiculturalism. (Standing Committee on Cultural Affairs and Heritage Resources, "Report to Manitoba Intercultural Council," March 28, 1987, pp. 1-2.)

2.3 A Responsive and Responsible Governmental Structure

As we have indicated, many of the proposals put forward in the Green Paper are not new and have, in fact, been sitting before government for some time. Some have been implemented, many others have not. The key consideration must be, therefore, to ensure that community needs are articulated to government, and that government responds. We must emphasize that government must respond to, not necessarily agree with, the community articulation. As well, there should be mechanisms in place both to monitor the progress of a multicultural policy through government and to ensure that the government does in fact respond to the articulation of community needs. There is no question that the community needs have been articulated. There is also no question that satisfactory government response in many areas has not been forthcoming.

The Green Paper proposes the creation "an administrative structure to ensure fulfillment of individual and group expectations as recommended by the Task Force." We do not agree. What is required are mechanisms to ensure that government commitments to ethnocultural communities are met, that communities have the means by which to articulate their concerns, and that the public have the opportunity to review the success of government in meeting its commitments to multiculturalism. It is naive and unrealistic to expect any government structure to ensure fulfillment of group expectations; it is essential that government structures respond openly to those expectations. Nor do we believe that the Task Force can or should recommend the community expectations. What it should do is utilize those expectations to develop and propose a policy and propose mechanisms which answer those expectations. It must recognize, of course, that the communities are already doing this on their own, in concert with others and through the Manitoba Intercultural Council.

We are surprised that the Green Paper proposes such an unwieldy and undesirable bureaucracy as the Multicultural Affairs Directorate which would duplicate most of MIC's current responsibilities.

We are concerned that the Green Paper provides no explanation of its proposals for a Multicultural Affairs Directorate. There is no argument presented as to why "there should be an infrastructure that is within government and responsible to government in addition to MIC." Why should there be? How does the Task Force explain the Green Paper's statement that "there is no formal government body designed to promote and effect management of multicultural affairs" when it goes on to note the existence of the Manitoba Intercultural Council. Why does the Green Paper not even touch on the role of the Manitoba Intercultural Council in the affairs of the Government of Manitoba?

We are concerned that the Green Paper does not outline the structures which presently exist within and external to government and assess their utility. Why is so much of the Green Papaer devoted to presenting a detailed mandate for its proposed Directorate without first presenting a consideration of the structures and mechanisms which already exist?

The establishment of a Multicultural Affairs Directorate would be a fundamental mistake. Not only is the notion of creating additional bureaucracy at a time of governmental restraint unrealistic, it would be unwise to create a structure which would only duplicate work already being done or work which should be done by existing structures; which would only draw already scarce funds away from the communities; and, if the experience of the federal government teaches any lessons, which would be a focal point for all departments to offload their responsibilities for multicultural endeavours. We have seen this happen repeatedly at the federal level and the communities do not want it to happen provincially. The idea of a Directorate also flies in the face of the Green Paper's expressed concerns about ghettoization of the communities, for most assuredly a Directorate would result in ghettoization of multiculturalism in government.

There is little serious demand among Manitoba's ethnocultural communities for such a Directorate. It is true that there is a certain attraction to the symbolism inherent in a specific office, but what the communities really want are for the existing structures and mechanisms, including MIC, to work effectively. They want a declared policy of multiculturalism for this province, preferably enshrined in statute. They want direct involvement in the policy development process. They want control over their futures and the ability to have government respond to their decisions. They do not want additional bureaucracy, particularly a bureaucracy which presumes to know the community needs and which presumes to take care of them.

The Task Force must know that virtually all the important responsibilities proposed for the Directorate are presently the responsibility of the Manitoba Intercultural Council; the others are the responsibility of existing government bodies and personnel. For example, the proposed mandate of the Directorate is the mandate of the Council. The Council does research. The Council informs the communities of relevant government programs (as do all the vario s communications directors within government). The Council works with government departments, agencies, boards and commissions. The Council works to ensure that all government policies and programs reflect the concerns and needs of the ethnocultural communities. The Council identifies gaps in policies, programs and legislation. The Council analyzes and monitors proposed and existing policies and programs to inform departments and agencies of the potential impact

on ethnocultural communities. The Council undertakes research and prepares position papers and background materials and shares this with government departments. The Council monitors and evaluates multicultural developments in Manitoba, other provinces and natio.ally and works with other bodies both internal and external to government. The Council develops policy recommendations on all matters relating to the ethnocultural communities. The Council advises government departments, agencies and corporations on the implications of their policies and programs. The Council communicates to government departments information on issues of concern to ethnocultural communities. Th% Council consults with the communities not only on special issues, but regularly and on all issues.

What then is left for the proposed Directorate to do which does not duplica4e the MIC's work? The Green Paper proposes that the Directorate would coordinate and analyze government responses regarding ethnocultural issues. That is or should be the job the Multicultural Coordinator. T(e Directorate would establish and work closely with interdepartmental committees. The Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Multiculturalism already exists. The Directorate would develop and maintain an overall communication strategy. That is the job of the Communications Directors in the various departments. The Directorate would "communicate government policies and responses regarding issues affecting the status of ethnocultural communities or persons." Surely that is the responsibility of the Minister Responsible. The Directorate would prepare position papers and briefings for the Minister. Existing staff, including the Multicultural Coordinator, do this. The Directorate would prepare a quarterly newsletter. The Executive Council of the Government of Manitoba and most departments already do. The Directorate would "develop and coordinate media relations." What do the Communications Directors do if not develop and coordinate media relations.?

Once one has eliminated from the mandate of the proposed Directorate all duplicated responsibilities, the following is left:

"Inform the public of activities of the Directorate."
"Respond to public request of information".

This, we suggest, would not be very helpful in advancing multiculturalism in Manitoba.

There are changes which must be made to governmental structures if we are to have an effective multicultural policy. We would suggest the following framework as an alternative for the Task Force's consideration. It is based on the premise that, pending completion of the review of all government policies and programs by the Task Force, we should attempt to make existing structures work effectively rather than duplicate them.

There should be a provincial statute which would enshrine the principles of a multicultural policy and which would make all other statutes and creatures of the province, such as municipalities and school divisions, subject to those principles. The Ethnocultural Affairs Committee of Cabinet would be established by such a statute and the existence and fundamental role of the Manitoba Intercultural Council would be reaffirmed.

The Ethnocultural Affairs Committee of Cabinet should be provided with a Secretariat which would be headed by the province's Multicultural Coordinator. The Multicultural Coordinator would report to the Minister Responsible for Multiculturalism.

The Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Multiculturalism must be affirmed. The Deputy Ministers who form its core membership should be responsible for the implementation of the multicultural policy and should be held accountable by having specific and measurable performance objectives for implementation written into their job descriptions.

The Manitoba Intercultural Council Act should be so amended, or the new Multiculturalism Act should require, that the Minister Responsible for Multiculturalism must respond substantively in writing to the recommendations of the Manitoba Intercultural Council within a specified period of time after receiving the recommendations, such responses to be tabled in the Legislature. The Council is required under its Act to respond to specific requests for advice from the Minister and we note that there have been few such requests. Greater use of this provision would alleviate any concerns by government that its issues and needs are being ignored by the Council.

There is also a need to clarify the role of the Council vis-a-vis departments in terms of its authority to request certain information from departments. While there have been few problems so far, there is the potential for difficulty in the future. Legislative clarity emphasizing the responsibility of departments to respond to the Council may be helpful.

The above measures would move multiculturalism significantly ahead in Manitoba. Along with these measures, of course, the Manitoba Intercultural Council must continually review its own performance.

There is also a need for one more element - a neutral, independent, impartial and authoritative observer who can be charged with the responsibility to review the progress of government departments in attaining their goals under the multicultural policy. As in so many other areas, Manitoba could lead the way by establishing such an observer.

Fortunately, such an impartial and authoritative observer already exists under Manitoba law. The Ombudsman of Manitoba can be directed by the provincial Cabinet to investigate and report on "any matter relating to administration in or by any department or agency of the government, or by any officer, employee or member thereof" (Sec. 16(2) The Ombudsman Act). The Ombudsman could be requested to report annually on the status of the implementation of the multicultural policy. Many communities have requested such a position at the national level, usually calling it a Commissioner of Multiculturalism. Some have called for such a Commissioner provincially. Utilizing the Ombudsman could be an effective and cost-efficent option.

3.0 THE FUTURE

The Manitoba Intercultural Council looks forward to the Task Force's review of the Council. We welcome a fair, informed and impartial critique of our work.

We also look forward to the final Report of the Task Force. As the Task Force knows, the Minister has requested the Manitoba Intercultural Council to advise the Government on the various recommendations to be put forward in the Task Force's Final Report. Our advice will of course be based on extensive community consultation and after the most careful deliberation by the members of Council.

We are confident that the Task Force will issue a Report which expresses the confidence which the ethnocultural communities feel, which addresses their needs and aspirations, and which proposes realistic and workable proposals for action. The Task Force can rest assured that its every proposal will receive careful scrutiny by the ethnocultural communities and those proposals which find favour among the communites will have as their strongest advocate the Manitoba Intercultural Council.

APPENDIX I

Comparison of Task Force Recommendations and
Manitoba Intercultural Council Recommendations 1983-1987

Task Force	Manitoba Intercultural Council
A. CULTURE	
Heritage Language Training	
a) school divisions make heritage language training a priority.	MIC recommended in Nov. 1984 that the Public Schools Act be amended to require divisions to introduce a language of study programme where there were a sufficient number of pupils.
b) the preservice and inservice programmes for teachers be expanded and improved to meet the need for heritage language programmes in the school.	MIC recommended in June 1987 that the Department of Education provide for the development of preservice and inservice programmes for heritage language teachers and for other individuals concerned with heritage language teaching.
c) schools review and change their policy which requires participation by a minimum number of students before a programme can be funded.	MIC recommended in Nov. 1984 that the Public Schools Act be amended to reduce the required number of students from 23 to 15.
d) school boards provide recourse for taxpayers to appeal in cases where requests for heritage language programmes are turned down.	MIC recommended in Nov. 1984 that the Public Schools Act be amended to permit the Minister of Education to require school boards to arrange for language instruction if the number of students is less than statutorily required.
e) the Manitoba Public Schools Act be reviewed and amended to provide school bus transportation for those who wish to enroll in heritage language programmes and who live outside the boundaries of the school (but within the jurisdiction of the same school board) offering the desired programmes.	MIC recommended major changes to the Public Schools Act in Nov. 1984 including provisions for bus transportation within divisions.
f) the Manitoba Department of Education be encouraged to advance and expand curriculum development in heritage languages.	MIC recommended in June 1987 the establishment of a Heritage Language Resources Committee.
g) heritage language training be encouraged and made available to any Manitoban interested in studying a particular heritage language.	MIC agrees, and in June 1987 also recommended that a multicultural subject be taught at the same time as language classes for those students not taking the language class.
h) accreditation for teachers of heritage languages be provided in the form of a Heritage Language Instructors' Certificate.	MIC recommended in Nov. 1984 that non-certified but qualified heritage language teachers be issued special the authorization to teach language.

i) needs assessments be conducted prior to the implementation of an accreditation programme for teachers of heritage languages.	MIC recommended in June 1987 that "the Department of Education must take a very serious look at the policy and process of certification of heritage language teachers."
Cultural Group Development	
a) the Recreation Branch of Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Recreation increase their assistance to cultural groups and communities in the development of their long-range plans including assistance with the development of needs assessments, goals and objectives.	MIC presented an extensive paper in March 1987 which discussed the need for community development strategies and procedures and proposed that the Department of CHR develop a review of its programs, mandate, policy, and organize seminars or workshops to inform funding groups "about funding and teach them how to develop and set organizational priorities."
b) Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Recreation recognize the importance of group development by reallocating funds to provide an increased maximum limit on operating grants to the communities.	MIC has annually recommended increases and changes to the Department's grants programmes and in March 1986 also proposed the creation of a new programme for organizations provincial in scope.
Official Languages	
It is recommended that official language instruction be made more accessible so that Manitobans who wish to learn either of the official languages may be encouraged to do so.	MIC's first recommendation in September 1983 was in support of proposed amendments to Section 23 of the Manitoba Act with respect to the official languages of Manitoba.
Interethnic Relations	
a) the provincial government support activities that bring various groups together, such as conferences.	Section 9 of the Manitoba Intercultural Council Act provides for such a conference every 2 years. The priority of the MIC's funding programme is for intercultural activities, as is that of the Department of CHR following an MIC recommendation in March 1984.
b) various organizations and service institutions such as schools, those providing health care, coordinating the arts, serving justice and those responsible for policing, among others, establish joint planning committees for programmes or activities of common concern which include members from various ethnocultural communities.	

Multicultural Education

a) schools in their present and future educational programmes, teach curricula that reflect the arts, literature and culture of a multicultural Manitoba society.	MIC recommended in March 1984 that the Department of Education monitor and assess the multicultural component of its Social Studies curriculum. MIC also recommended in June 1987 that courses in civilization pertinent to all ethnic groups should be made part of the curriculum; that the Department undertake a concerted revision of texts; and that more attention be given to the study of histories of countries other than Western Europe.
b) schools be encouraged to develop a curriculum based on consultation with and participation by appropriate resource persons who are members of ethnocultural groups.	MIC proposed seven separate recommendations in this area in June 1987, including: the Department and school boards guarantee the participation of ethnocultural organizations in every aspect of multicultural policies and programmes; that materials prepared by community groups be utilized; that the Department fund groups to develop appropriate curriculum materials; that senior citizens be utilized as resource people.
c) each school division be encouraged and assisted in the development of a multicultural educational policy.	MIC recommended in June 1987 that "all school boards should develop multicultural policies. These policy statements should be accompanied by an action statement for implementation purposes."
d) school boards, community colleges and universities require appropriate personnel to enroll in cross cultural education inservice programmes.	MIC recommended in June 1987 that divisions must provide regular multicultural and intercultural inservice programmes. MIC also proposed a conference for educators, which was sponsored by the Department of Education in 1985.
e) the provincial government include multicultural education in all in-service programmes for education.	
f) schools, universities and community colleges be encouraged to adopt hiring policies that reflect the multiethnic community they serve.	MIC recommended in June 1987 that school boards "review their hiring criteria to ensure that staffing reflects the ethnocultural diversity of Manitoba and initiate affirmative action programmes where warranted."
g) the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba jointly fund the establishment of ethnic chairs for the purpose of encouraging research and teaching in multiculturalism. For example, a chair in Native Studies at Brandon University and a chair in multicultural education or multiculturalism at the University of Manitoba.	MIC recommended in June 1987 the establishment of a multicultural education granting program.

h) faculties of education be encouraged to make a course in multiculturalism required for all prospective teachers.

MIC recommended in March 1984 that multicultural/intercultural courses be required in the faculties of Education.

Arts

a) in keeping with the concept of intercultural relations, the provincial government encourage and support arts activities that bring various arts groups together regardless of whether they are professionals or amateurs for the purpose sharing and learning from one another.

See Manitoba Intercultural Council, "Report on State of the Ethnocultural Arts and Crafts in Manitoba: Winnipeg Area," October 1986.

b) the provincial government establish a monitoring agency to develop criteria for the allocation of grants to arts groups by various agencies.

c) various organizations and agencies serving the arts groups be encouraged to adopt hiring policies that reflect the multiethnic community they serve.

Media

a) provincial government advertising policy include a requirement that the ethnocultural reality be recognized.

In January 1985 the Manitoba Intercultural Council recommended to the Government of Manitoba a statement of Government Policy Pertaining to the Proper Portrayal of Minorities in Government Advertising and Communications. This statement was accepted by the Government.

b) when the provincial government enters into advertising contracts with other agencies, that these agencies be required to recognize the ethnocultural reality.

In May 1987 the MIC argued before the House of Commons Standing Committee on Culture and Communications that "all levels of governments be urged to persuade their respective sponsored advertising agencies to take affirmative action in employing visible minorities.

c) the provincial government award a proportional number of advertising the contracts to the ethnocultural press.

In February 1984 the Manitoba Intercultural Council advised Ethnocultural Affairs Committee of Cabinet that the existing advertising guidelines excluded virtually all ethnic media from receiving government advertising. By March 1984 the guidelines had been amended to include virtually all ethnic media.

d) a systematic method of monitoring the media be instituted and a system for communicating their information to the media be considered.

In 1984 the MIC recommended to the Canadian Radio-Television Telecommunications Commission that "every licensee should submit a proposal whereby they demonstrate a plan for monitoring the content of their programming and for ensuring that high standards in accurate, fair and balanced portrayals of ethnocultural communities are achieved. The CRTC should also monitor the licensee's program content and set standards for fairness, accuracy and balance which should become a part of the procedure for granting licenses."

In May 1987, in a submission to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Culture and Communications, the MIC reiterated the above position and also called for: an advisory group of representatives of ethnocultural communities be formed to advise the media industry; that all governments should adopt multicultural advertising policies; and that there be established a media watch by ethnocultural organizations on a regional and national basis.

e) an ongoing series of short workshops be sponsored to familiarize media personnel with the issues, problems and solutions to stereotypical portrayal.

In May 1987 the Manitoba Intercultural Council recommended that the CBC should improve its community relations programme and in particular should encourage, support and assist activities such as workshops and other creative encounters which encourage minority professionals, writers, poets and producers to create for television and radio.

Civil Service Personnel

a) the Civil Service Commission adopt Cross-cultural education as an integral part of its training programme.

In June 1986 the MIC advised the government that it supported the Training for Trainers Institute which would "deliver cross-cultural training to various social agencies and public and private organizations." Persons who completed the program were expected to do cross-cultural training and assume a leadership role in the cross-cultural field. The MIC also advised the government that through the Civil Service Commission the government underwrite a major share of the Institute and that several CSC trainers take the course and that the remaining spaces be open to non-government and government agencies.

b) various departments of government include cross-cultural education as topics for professional development sessions.

See above.

c) government Boards and Commissions and Crown Corporations introduce a programme of cross-cultural training for its senior management and staff.

See above.

B. EQUALITY

Equality

a) the affirmative measures consistent with the intent of Section 15 (11) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms be mandatory in the public service with respect to the definition of goals and timetables that shall function as a standard of performance be done for the public service. The public service shall include the Civil Service as well as hospitals, universities, school boards and crown corporations.

In March 1984 the MIC advised the provincial government to include visible minorities as a target group in its Affirmative Action Program. This was immediately done. The MIC also advised that further research also towards the inclusion of audible minorities in the Affirmative Action Program.

b) these measures be applied universally as management imperatives and goals throughout the public service.

See above.

c) these measures be applied in the provision of all services to the public.

See above.

d) parallel special measures be implemented to eliminate the causes of systemic discrimination (for example, admissions to professional faculties, the professions, trades, and so on).

In August 1987 the MIC advised the government to commission an intensive study examining the entry requirements of professions and trades in Manitoba. The MIC also advised that there be an advisory body to the study, consisting of the MIC and the relevant government departments.

e) contract compliance with these measures in all relevant contractual relationships in the public and private sectors be established.

Human Rights

a) the educational component of the Human Rights Commission be strengthened and required.

In March 1986 the MIC proposed that the Commission be required to allocate at least 20% of its operating budget to education and outreach activities.

b) a program of human rights education be developed for implementation in the public school curriculum.

In March 1987 the MIC recommended that the Minister of Education establish a policy of teaching Human Rights Education in Manitoba schools, and that the Department participate in pilot projects on Human Rights Education developed by the Canadian Human Rights Foundation.

In June 1987 the MIC proposed that materials be developed to assist in teaching human rights, both by the Commission and by outside organizations.

c) human rights education be required in industrial settings, especially among those industries which hire a high proportion of newly arrived immigrants and refugees.

d) specific government departments with responsibilities for the delivery of services require their personnel to attend an orientation course that informs them of individual rights that are derived from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Manitoba Human Rights Code.

C. ADMINISTRATION

There is no formal government body designed to promote and effect management of multicultural affairs. The only body that is presently in existence is a legislated community-based advisory body, the Manitoba Intercultural Council (MIC). There should be an infrastructure that is within government and responsible to government in addition to MIC.

See Manitoba Intercultural Council's Observations on the Green Paper of the Task Force on Multiculturalism in Manitoba.